

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark.Office .Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

			www.uspto.gov	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,147	12/15/2000	Yasuo Kobayashi	200669US0DIV	9061
22850 7	590 03/20/2002			
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC			EXAMINER	
	ON DAVIS HIGHWA	Y	DANG, THI D	
ARLINGTON,	VA 22202	* A <sub>m</sub>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 03/20/2002	. う

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			5			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/736,147	KOBAYASHI ET AL.			
. • (	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Thi Dang	1763			
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication app ply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6 - If the period - If NO period - Failure to re - Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If or reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, seelived by the Office later than three months after the mailing and term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)□ Re	sponsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
2a) <u></u> Th	is action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
	nce this application is in condition for allowa sed in accordance with the practice under of Claims					
4)⊠ Clai	m(s) <u>1-9 and 16-31</u> is/are pending in the a	pplication.	•			
4a) (	Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Clai	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 16-31</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Clai	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application F	Papers					
9) <u></u> The	specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ The	drawing(s) filed on <u>15 December 2000</u> is/a	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected t	to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The	oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)⊠ Ack	nowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).			
a)⊠ A	Ⅱ b) Some * c) None of:					
1.	Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
2.	Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Applicati	on No. <u>09/086,574 and</u>			
<u>09/437,500</u> .						
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu he attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-			
	owledgment is made of a claim for domesti	•				
<i>,</i> —	The translation of the foreign language pro					
	owledgment is made of a claim for domest					

Application/Control Number: 09/736,147

Art Unit: 1763

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moslehi* (5,403,434).

Moslehi discloses an apparatus for removing native oxide. This apparatus includes a remote plasma generator connected to a treatment chamber and a gas injector (22) for supplying an additional gas downstream of the remote plasma generator. A gas distribution system is also provided to supply different gases to the treatment chamber and to the plasma generator.

Moslehi also discloses means for supplying hydrogen gas and inert gas to the remote plasma generator and means for supplying halogen-containing gas (e.g. HF) to the treatment chamber (col. 10 lines 20-26; col. 11, lines 7-14). It is obvious that the non-plasma gas injector of Moslehi's apparatus is capable of supplying any fluorinated gas including NF<sub>3</sub> because the gas injector is not limited to any particular halogen-containing gas.

Claims 16, 17, 19-22, 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mihara* et al. in view of *Lee*.

Mihara discloses an apparatus for ashing and etching that has all of the claimed structures (see Figs. 3 and 17B). Mihara's apparatus includes: a plasma generating section (26); a treatment vessel (21); a temperature controller (29) that is composed of a heater and a chiller; and lifting pins (38) for holding the wafer in the heated state (col. 9, lines 19-40; col. 12, lines

Art Unit: 1763

29-62). In *Mihara*'s apparatus, the heating means is located in the wafer holder and heating occurs when the wafer is held on the susceptor (28). Thus, the heating position in *Mihara*'s apparatus is not when the wafer is lifted by the lifting pins. *Lee* teaches to provide means for cooling and heating a wafer in the same chamber. A wafer supporting stage with cooling means provides cooling. Heating is performed by providing lamps above the wafer is and a plurality of pins to lift the wafer above the wafer supporting stage during heating (col. 13, lines 5-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute the heating means in *Mihara*'s apparatus with heating lamps arranged above the wafer because providing lamps to heat the wafer would be a conventional alternative to providing a heater in the wafer susceptor.

Claims 20-22 recite limitations relating to an intended use of the claimed apparatus, but they do not add any structural limitation that would define the claimed apparatus over that of prior art.

Claims 18, 23-25, 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moslehi* (5,403,434) in view of *Lee*.

Moslehi's apparatus has most of the claimed structures, as discussed above. Even though Fig. 1 of Moslehi shows the wafer supporter holding the wafer face down, it would have been obvious to modify the reactor configuration so that the plasma and non-plasma gases are introduced above a wafer that is being held face up because Moslehi's treatment is not dependent on the wafer being face down and is adaptable to other reactor configuration. Moslehi's apparatus also includes a heating lamp for heating the substrate, but no cooling means. It would have been obvious to provide a susceptor with cooling means in Moslehi's apparatus and lifting mechanism for supporting the wafer above the susceptor during heating because Lee teaches that

Application/Control Number: 09/736,147

Art Unit: 1763

it is conventional to provide both heating means and cooling means in the same chamber, and by adding the cooling means to *Moslehi*'s apparatus, it could be used for processing different steps.

Moslehi also discloses a cluster tool setup that includes the cleaning chamber discussed above and film forming chambers (Fig. 5; cols. 14-15).

Claims 30 and 31 recite limitations relating to an intended use of the claimed apparatus, but they do not add any structural limitation that would define the claimed apparatus over that of prior art.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 23-25, 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 23-25 recite the limitation "the NF3-gas supply section" but there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 28 and 29 fail to recite how the surface treatment apparatus recited in claim 16 is structurally related to the "cluster system."

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Bersin, Kikuchi et al, Moslehi, Hayasaka et al are cited to show related prior art.

Art Unit: 1763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thi Dang whose telephone number is (703) 308-1973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

T.D. March 17, 2002 THI DANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700